

sary for me to enumerate led to difficulties. The colonies then stood side by side, acknowledging their allegiance to Great Britain; for as late as 1776, in the beginning of that year, the colonies, although then in arms, had no idea of final separation from Great Britain. Separation had not entered into their ideas. The Declaration of Independence came in 1776, and that severed the connection with Great Britain. The colonies waged war to resist aggressions, to repel the exercise of powers which the mother country attempted to assume over them; among other things to resist the payment of taxes without representation. Although they were separate and distinct colonies, when the war of the Revolution broke out, they recognized the common bond that bound them to her, and side by side they stood up in defence of their rights, as they had stood side by side in defence of the rights of the mother country, as was evidenced by the commingled blood and efforts of all who fell in the old French and Indian wars. And when blood flowed at Lexington and Concord, then indeed the hearts of this great people beat in sympathetic response. Because Massachusetts, a sister colony, had been attacked, it was felt from one end of the country to the other, that the wrongs of a sister colony was the wrong of all the colonies; and they sprang to arms and resisted the attempt to injure that sister colony. The oppression of one led to the resistance of all.

Delegates were sent to a Congress which met in this very city. And another Congress was called in 1775. What did they propose to do? Why were they called together? Let us read some of the declarations made by the colonies, when they sent their delegates to the Congress of 1774.

New Hampshire—"To devise, consult and adopt such measures as may have the most likely tendency to extricate the colonies from their present difficulties; to secure and perpetuate their rights, liberties and privileges, and to restore that peace, harmony and mutual confidence, which once happily subsisted between the parent country and her colonies."

Massachusetts—"To consult on the present state of the colonies, and the miseries to which they are, and must be reduced, by the operation of certain acts of Parliament respecting America; and to deliberate and determine upon wise and proper measures to be by them recommended to all the colonies, for the recovery and establishment of their just rights and liberties, civil and religious, and the restoration of union and harmony between Great Britain and the colonies, most ardently desired by all good men."

Virginia—"To consider of the most proper and effectual manner of so operating on the commercial connection of the colonies with the mother country, as to procure redress for the much injured province of Massachusetts

Bay, to secure British America from the ravage and ruin of arbitrary taxes, and speedily to procure the return of that harmony and union so beneficial to the whole empire, and so ardently desired by all British America."

South Carolina—"To consider the acts lately passed and bills depending in Parliament with regard to the port of Boston and colony of Massachusetts Bay, which acts and bills, in the precedent and consequences, affect the whole continent of America, also the grievances under which America labors, by reason of the several acts of Parliament that impose taxes or duties for raising a revenue, and lay unnecessary restraints and burdens on trade," &c.

I will not read them all. These are enough to show that at that early day, although there was no common bond or ligament binding the colonies together, further than that which grew out of their common relation to Great Britain as the mother country, yet we find that Virginia and South Carolina—those States now so devastated, whose mountains and rivers are running with blood—met together in Congress to aid Massachusetts. A sweet return they have had for it!

But it is not necessary to dwell upon this point. There can be no sort of pretence that before the Declaration of Independence there was any such thing as this paramount allegiance. Where then does it come from? Am I pointed to the Declaration of Independence, or to the articles of confederation, and told that those articles made them one nation, and bound them together as one people? I answer, no, sir; because the articles themselves, upon their very face, in all their length and breadth, negative such an idea. The preamble is, "Articles of confederation and perpetual union between the States"—not between the Union, not of a nation, but "between the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations," &c., naming the original thirteen States. The very first article says, "The style of this confederacy shall be 'The United States of America.'"

Now, for fear I may forget it, I will say that is the very language used in the federal compact upon which this consolidation idea is founded, and from which it is derived. If I have time I will show this Convention that the Congress which framed these articles of confederation was the very same Congress which was in session when the Declaration of Independence was made and adopted. And this language being used by the same Convention, under the same circumstances, under the same instructions from their several constituencies, we are bound to put the same interpretation upon it. The articles of confederation then are between the several States, and the confederacy is termed "The United States of America." Those articles were adopted, not by the votes of a majority of